DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 480 CG 017 640

AUTHOR O'Neil, James M.; And Others
TITLE Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS): Men's Gender Role Conflict.
SPONS AGENCY Kansas Univ., Lawrence. General Research Fund.
PUB DATE 26 Aug 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (90th, Washington, DC, August 23-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Fear; Higher Education; *Males; Personality Traits; Physical Health; *Psychological Patterns; *Role Conflict; *Sex Role
IDENTIFIERS *Fear of Femininity Scale

ABSTRACT

One unified aspect of men's gender role conflict is the fear of femininity, which can produce six conflicts: restrictive emotionality; homophobia; socialized control, power, and competition; restrictive affectionate behavior; obsession with achievement and success; and health care problems. To measure these constructs 85 items were generated from the six gender role conflicts. To gain empirical support for the construct validity and reliability of the Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS) it was administered to 527 male college students. Subjects also completed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). An analysis of the results showed that 37 of the original 85 items met criteria for inclusion in the final scale. Four significant factors were found that had relevance to the hypothesized FOFS and patterns of gender role conflict: success/power/competition; restrictive emotionality; homophobia; and conflicts between work and leisure--family relations. Acceptable test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities were demonstrated for the factors and total scores. Subjects who differentiated on the PAQ categories also showed significant differences on the first three factors of the FOFS. Post hoc analysis revealed significant and meaningful differences from a theoretical perspective. Further research is needed on other, more diverse, and older samples. (Author/BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247480

Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS): Men's Gender Role conflict[1]

James M. O'Neil

University of Connecticut

Laurence David

Lawrence Wrightsman

University of Kansas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James M. O'Neil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 017640

The authors are indebted to Dr. Nancy Betz (Ohio State University) who generously gathered data for us during the Spring semester, 1982.

This research was supported by a grant from the General Research Fund of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. This paper was presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., August 26, 1982.

Abstract

This research describes men's gender role conflict and the effects of gender roles on men's self-report of psychological and physical health. One unified aspect of men's gender role conflict is the Fear of Femininity (FOF). Previous literature reviews suggests that FOF may produce six gender role conflicts including: 1) restrictive emotionality, 2) homophobia, 3) socialized control, power, and competition, 4) restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior, 5) obsession with achievement and success, 6) health care problems. The present study builds on the previous efforts to conceptualize gender role conflicts by developing a measure of these six constructs. Eighty-five items were generated from the six gender role conflicts hypthesized to be related to the FOF. The Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS) was administered to undergraduate men (N=527) as well as the short form of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Factor analyses and other procedures were used to reduce the item set to 37 items. Four significant factors were found that had relevance to the hypothesized FOFS and patterns of gender role conflict. Acceptable test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities were demonstrated for the factors and total score documenting the meaningfulness of the FOFS concept. MANOVA and ANOVA procedures indicated that subjects differentiated on the four PAQ categories showed significant differences on three of four FOFS factors. Post hoc analyzes revealed significant and meaningful differences from a theoretical perspective. Implications of the results for future research on the scale are discussed.

Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS):

Men's Gender Role Conflict

During the 1970's the psychology of gender roles became a significant area of scholarly inquiry and research investigation. The Feminist Movement helped us realize that adherence to stereotyped gender roles (or the learned behaviors and attitudes that are associated with masculinity and femininity) may restrict a woman's potential, both with regard to career development and in their interpersonal relations. Concern over women's restricted gender roles has produced a greater commitment to the psychology of women. In the 1980's, the psychology of men and their roles has become a natural extension of the earlier focus on women's gender roles. Scholarly investigation has begun to study the impact of restrictive gender roles, which produce psychological stress and strain in men's lives. Research on men's gender role conflict is important in helping us understand how restrictive gender roles negatively affect both sexes' psychological and physical health.

Measures to assess gender role orientation and attitudes toward gender roles have been developed (Bem, 1974; Doyle & Moore, 1978; Spence & Helmreich, 1978, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974, 1974). Measures that assess the degree that gender role orientation and conflict affect the sexes have been slower in development. One of the difficulties impeding the development of these measures is the lack of definitions on what gender role conflict really is.

For the purpose of this paper, gender role conflict is defined as a psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences or impact on the person or others (O'Neil, 1981a, 1982). The ultimate outcome of this conflict is the restriction of the person's ability to

actualize his or her human potential or the restriction of someone else's potential. Gender role strain is defined as excessive mental or physical tension caused by gender role conflict and rigidly socialized masculine and feminine roles. Garnets and Pleck (1979) believe that gender role strain is an intrapsychic process that can lead to poor psychological adjustment, particularly low self esteem. It is believed that when inflexible, rigid gender role norms set standards that do not allow people to freely express themselves, the results will be that these individuals will come to devalue themselves. Additionally, gender role conflict and strain can occur when we are devalued by others because we do not meet their gender role expectancies, ideals, or norms. Overall, gender role conflict occurs: 1) when rigidly defined gender roles result in unfair restrictions or violation of people's rights, 2) when gender roles produce negative consequences from unhealthy self devaluations and devaluation by others, and 3) when a person is not able to meet his or her own gender rol expectancies, ideals, or norms.

One unified aspect of men's gender role conflict is the fear of femininity. The fear of femininity is defined as a strong concern that one possesses or is seen as possessing feminine values, attitudes, and behaviors and that these will reflect negatively upon oneself (O'Neil, 1981b, 1982). Fears about femininity are primarily learned in early childhood when gender identity is formed by parents, peers, and the societal values. The dynamics of fearing one's femininity are not well understood and many times are unconscious to the man (Jung, 1959). When a man fears his feminine side he really fears that others will see him as stereotypically and negatively "feminine" (e.g., weak, dependent,

submissive) rather than positively "masculine." This is not an unreasonable fear since certain aspects of femininity are devalued in society. Like some women, men fear that exposing their feminine sides will result in devaluation, particularly in front of others. Men are cognizant that women's femininity is sometimes devalued by other men and they attempt to avoid situations where they could also be devalued. The cost of showing stereotypic feminine qualities could be disrespect, failure, and emasculation. These are high costs to a man who wants to be seen as masculine and live out the myths of masculinity (Pleck, 1981).

The fear of femininity has not been fully conceptualized in the literature. It has gone unlabeled, but numerous authors have written about how femininity threatens men during gender role socialization and over the life cycle (David & Brannon, 1976; Farrell, 1974; Goldberg, 1979; Levinson, 1978; Nichols, 1975; Olson, 1978). Other authors have individually specified how men's aversion to their stereotypic feminine qualities affects men's behaviors and psychological processes (Baker-Miller, 1976; David & Brannon, 1976; Goldberg, 1979; Jung, 1953, 1959; Lederer, 1968; Levinson, 1978; Nichols, 1975).

Previous analyses of men's gender role conflict and the fear of femininity have been presented in the literature (O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b; 1982). Figure 1 represents the latest conceptualization of the gender role conflicts related to the fear of femininity.

Insert Figure 1 about here

This model depicts men's socialization and the Masculine Mystique (O'Neil, 1981a) producing fears of femininity and six patterns of gender role

conflict and strain. These result when a man is concerned about his gender role and is unable to express the "feminine" aspect of his personality. These patterns include: 1) restrictive emotionality, 2) homophobia, 3) socialized control, power, and competition, 4) restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior, 5) obsession with achievement and success, and 6) health care problems. Further theoretical explanation of these concepts is found elsewhere (O'Neil, 1981b, 1982). This model makes five pivotal assumptions:

1) Men's socialization affects their masculine values, attitudes, and behaviors.
2) These values collectively represent a Masculine Mystique and Value System that can have negative consequences for men, women, and children.
3) In varying degrees, the Masculine Mystique and Value System devalues femininity (acts of sexism), overvalues musculinity, (acts of hypermasculinity) and produces fears about the man's femininity.
4) Men's fears about their femininity are central to understanding men's gender role conflict and sexism.
5) Aspects of men's fears of femininity are found in each of the six patterns of gender role conflict in Figure 1.

Empirical research is needed to measure men's fear of femininity and the six patterns of gender role conflict depicted in Figure 1. The goal of this research paper is to describe the initial development of an empirically reliable and valid Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS) using the six patterns found in Figure 1. Through a series of methodological and statistical procedures, an initial scale has been developed to assess men's gender role conflict and fears about their femininity.

It is hypothesized that items of FOFS scale will cluster into the six gender role factors found in Figure 1. Second, these factors and the entire scale will demonstrate moderately high reliability and validity. Third, it is hypothesized that subjects with different gender role orientations, measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, will differ with respect to the degree to which they express fears of possessing a "feminine" set of attitudes and needs. The overall purpose of the research was to gain empirical support for the construct validity and overall reliability of the FOFS and gender role conflict in men's lives.

Method

Subjects

Undergraduate men (N=527) at two midwestern universities enrolled in introductory psychology classes were the subjects. The mean age of the subjects was 19.8 years. Class levels of the subjects included: 57% Freshmen, 27% Sophomores, 11% Juniors, 5% Seniors. The marital status of subjects indicated 95% single, and 5% married.

Procedure

Operational definitions of the six patterns of gender role conflict shown in Figure 1 were developed from the previous theoretical literature (O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b, 1982). The six patterns are defined below:

1. Restrictive Emotionality - having difficulty expressing one's own feelings or denying others their rights to emotional expressiveness.

2. Homophobia - having fears of homosexuals or fear of being a homosexual including beliefs, myths, and stereotypes about gay people.

3. Control - to regulate, restrain, or to have others or situations under one's command.

   Power - to obtain authority, influence, or ascendancy over others.

Competition - striving against others to win or gain something.

4. Restricted Sexual and Affectionate Behavior - having limited ways of expressing one's sexuality and affection to others.

5. Obsession with Achievement and Success - having a disturbing and persistent preoccupation with work, accomplishment and eminence as a means of substantiating and demonstrating value.

6. Health Care Problems - having difficulties maintaining positive health care in terms of diet, exercise, relaxation, stress, and a healthy life style.

From these definitions, 85 items were generated that ask respondents to report their personal attitudes about their gender role conflict. The initial scale had the following number of items for each gender role conflict in Figure 1: 1) Restrictive Emotionality (N=15), 2) Health Care Problems (N=14), 3) Obsession with Achievement and Success (N=16), 4) Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behavior (N=17), 5) Control, Power, and Competition (N=14), 6) Homophobia (N=9). College students enrolled in introductory psychology classes were administered two instruments described below.

Instrumentation. The two scales used were the Fear of Femininity Scale and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire.

Fear of Femininity Scale (FOFS). This scale is an 85 item self report instrument designed to assess the six dimensions of gender role conflict in Figure 1. This measure asks subjects to report their personal gender role attitudes behaviors, and conflicts. Respondents are asked to write the degree that they agree or disagree to statements using six point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (6) to strongly disagree (1). Each statement expresses either inability to express feelings, expression of masculine goals, or fears about overt emotionality. Thus a high score reflects expression of "fear of femininity."

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) measures the psychological dimension of masculinity and femininity. The PAQ is 24 item self report instrument consisting of a number of trait descriptions, each set upon a bipolar scale. These trait description of dispositional properties make no reference to overt behavior or to the situations in which these dispositions are manifested. Each item describes a characteristic sterotypically believed to differentiate the sexes. The PAQ is divided into three separate scales labeled Masculinity (M), Femininity (F), and Masculinity-Femininity (MF). Median splits of subjects' PAQ scores produced medians for masculinity (M) and femininity (F) both at 23. These medians were used to classify subjects into masculine (high masculinity, low femininity), feminine (low-high), androgynous (high-high), or undifferentiated (low-low) gender role categories. Cronbach's alphas for the short form are .85, .82, and .78 for M, F, and M-F respectively (Spence & Helmreich (1978), indicating acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability. In content, the M scale contains socially desirable traits that are stereotypically more characteristic of males than females and refer to self assertive, instrumental attributes. The F scale contains socially desirable traits that are stereotypically more characteristic of females and refer to interpersonally-oriented expressive qualities. The MF scale consists of trait dimensions for which the social desirability ratings were related to gender, the ideal woman falling toward the stereotypically feminine pole and the ideal man toward the stereotypically masculine pole.

Data Analysis

Factor analyses, employing both principal components and common factor models, with both orthogonal and oblique rotations, were completed

on the 85-item FOFS. The goal of these numerous analyses was to determine the best simple structure of observed factors from the original 85 items (Rummel, 1970). Additional analyses were performed on the derived subset of items that were part of the factors. Internal consistency reliabilities, for each factor score and total score were calculated using Cronbach's alpha procedure. Four week test-retest reliabilities (N = 17) for factor scores and total scores were calculated using Pearson Product Moment correlations. A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on observed factors using the PAQ classifications for all subjects. Analyses of variance (ANOVA) procedures were completed on each factor score and the total score using the PAQ classifications for all subjects. Scheffé post hoc procedures were used to analyze differences between PAQ classified groups when significant ANOVA's were found.

A systematic procedure was utilized to reduce the number of items on the FOFS. The goal of this systematic reduction of items was to obtain the best items and factor structure from the original 85 items. A four-step procedure was employed to decide which items to retain for further analysis. First, all items were excluded that did not meet the criterion of having a standard deviation of at least 1.00; these items were essentially answered the same way by most respondents and hence did not discriminate. Second, each item had to correlate with at least one other item at the .30 level to be retained. Third, using a principal components factor analyses, each item had to load at the .30 level or better on a meaningful factor. Fourth, each item had to load at the .30 level or better on one or more of the first four factors of the common factor analysis. All items retained for the scale had to meet all of the above criteria.

Results

Using the item reduction procedure described above 37 items met the criteria for inclusion in the final scale. Common factor analysis with oblique rotations yielded the most significant factor structure for the FOFS. Table 1 lists the four emergent factors of the scale, as follows:

Insert Table 1 About Here

Factor 1 --Success, Power, Competition (13 items), Factor 2 -- Restrictive Emotionality (10 items), Factor 3 -- Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia (8 items), Factor 4 -- Conflicts Between Work and Leisure - Family Relations (6 items). The mean item factor loadings for these four factors ranged from .54-.60. The four factors explained 36% of the total variance with each factor contributing the following percentage: Factor 1. -- 17.2%; Factor 2. -- 7.6%; Factor 3 -- 6.8%; Factor 4 -- 4.6%.

Assessments of the scales' reliabilities found internal consistency scores using Cronbach's alpha ranged from .75-.85 with a total score reliability of .88. Four-week test-retest reliabilities (N=17) ranged from .72 to .86 for each factor with a total score reliability of .80. The final version of the 37 item FOFS scale is found in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for the four factors and total score according to the PAQ categories. Multiple analysis of

Insert Table 3 About Here

variance (MANOVA) indicated an overall significant main effect, $F(12,535) = 9.87$, $p < .000$. Univariate analysis of variance on the four factors indicated significant differences on three of the four factors. Significant differences between PAQ categories were found for Factor 1 (Success, Power, Competition), $F(3,519) = 7.86$, $p < .001$; Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality), $F(3,522) = 20.43$, $p < .000$; Factor 3 (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), $F(3,522) = 9.69$, $p < .000$. No significant differences were found for Factor 4 (Conflicts Between Work and Leisure-Family Relations), $F(3,522) = .871$, $p > .05$. Significant differences were also found for total score across the PAQ categories, $F(3,516) = 12.04$, $p < .000$.

Post-hoc Scheffe procedures indicated a number of significant differences between the four PAQ groups and the factor scores ($p < .05$). First, those men reflecting masculine gender role types on the PAQ reported significantly higher scores on Factor 1 (Success, Power, and Competition) than men who were feminine or undifferentiated types. Second, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated gender role types on the PAQ reported significantly higher scores on Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality) than androgynous types. Also, undifferentiated gender role types report significantly higher scores on the restrictive emotionality factor than feminine, masculine, or androgynous types. Third, masculine and undifferentiated gender role types report significantly higher scores on Factor 3 (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia) than androgynous types. Also, undifferentiated

gender role types report significantly higher socres on this factor than the feminine types. Lastly, both undifferentiated and masculine gender role types reported signficantly higher total scores on the FOFS than the androgynous and feminine types.

Discussion

These initial results indicate that the FOFS items did cluster into some of the factors hypothesized as related to men's gender role conflicts (See Figure 1 and O'Neil, 1981a, 1982). The factor analyses yielded four significant and meaningful factors with acceptable reliability levels (both internal consistency and over time).

All mean item factor loadings were greater than .54 and all tests of reliability were greater than .72. First, restrictive emotionality as a gender role conflict pattern appears to be supported. Second, the control, power, and competition pattern and the obsession with achievement and success pattern were combined into one meaningful factor, which we have renamed success, power, and competition. Third, homophobia and restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior patterns show a common factor renamed restrictive affectionate behavior between men-homophobia. Fourth, the last significant factor, conflict between work and leisure-family relations captures aspects of life style found in health care problems and obsession with achievement and success patterns. The health care problems pattern received the least individual support of the six gender role conflicts hypothesized. Although more research is needed, the initial data on the FOFS indicate acceptable conceptual differentiation and reliability for a college student population.

The significant group differences between the PAQ and FOFS provide support for the validity of the FOFS. The results indicate that subjects in different PAQ categories expressed different degrees of difficulty with Factor 1 (Success, Power, and Competition), Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality), Factor 3 (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia). There were also differences on the total score of the FOFS across PAQ categories.

Spence and Helmreich's (1980) analysis of the PAQ gives the significant group data a meaningful context. They indicate that the PAQ is a trait measure of socially desirable instrumental and expressive characteristics rather than a direct measure of gender role behaviors. In this regard, our subjects categorized as masculine are considered instrumental and having instrumental attributes (e.g., independent, active, self confident). Likewise subjects categorized as feminine are considered expressive and other interpersonally oriented qualities (e.g. kind, tactful, aware of other's feelings). Subjects categorized as androgynous (high masculine and feminine attributes) would show both instrumental and expressive qualities. Subjects categorized as undifferentiated (low in both masculine and feminine attributes) would be limited in both instrumental and expressive qualities. These PAQ category descriptions help explain the group differences on the FOFS factors and total score.

For example, both masculine and undifferentiated subjects were found to have significantly higher total FOFS scores than feminine and androgynous subjects. Instrumental subjects, lacking expressive traits (masculine men) and subjects limited in both expressive and instrumental traits (undifferentiated men) reported overall greater total scores on the FOFS than subjects self reporting expressive traits (feminine men)

and those reporting both expressive and instrumental traits (androgynous men). These results indicate that subjects who self report expressive traits (feminine and androgynous) on the PAQ have lower total score on the FOFS than those who do not have these attributes.

Additionally, for Factor 1 (Success, Power, and Competition), instrumental subjects lacking expressive traits (masculine men), reported significantly higher FOFS scores than expressive subjects (Feminine men) and men without expressive or instrumental traits (undifferentiated men). The presence of strong instrumental traits yields a higher FOFS score on the success, power, and competition factor. For Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality), subjects reporting limited expressive or instrumental traits (undifferentiated) reported significantly higher FOFS scores than all other PAQ groups. The undifferentiated subjects clearly reported significantly more difficulty with restrictive emotionality than any other group. Also, androgynous subjects reported significantly lower scores (less difficulty) than any other PAQ group on the restrictive emotionality factor. For Factor 3 (Restrictive Affectional Behavior Toward Men - Homophobia), subjects reporting expressive traits (feminine and androgynous) indicated significantly less difficulty in demonstrating affectionate behavior toward other men than those subjects without expressive traits (masculine or undifferentiated men). In other words, those subjects who reported limited expressive traits (feminine) reported significantly more difficulty with this factor compared to those who reported expressiveness to be a part of themselves.

These initial results show promise for the FOFS measure but further research is needed on other, more diverse, and older samples before the

measure can be used by other researchers. The factor structure of the FOFS does account for five of six aspects of men's gender role conflict shown in Figure 1. Additionally, the group differences on the FOFS for the PAQ categories suggests that men who describe themselves as expressive or instrumental report differential degrees of difficulty with success, power, competition, emotionality, and affection toward other men. Further research and instrument design should be directed at developing a scale that assesses the situational aspects of these problems as they are manifested in men's lives.

References

Baker-Miller, J. Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

David, D.S. & Brannon, R. The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1976.

Doyle, J.A. & Moore, R.J. Attitudes toward the Male's Role Scale (AMR): An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the male's sex role in contemporary society. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1978, 8(2), 35.

Farrell, W. The liberated man. New York: Bantam Books, 1974.

Garnets, L. & Pleck, J.H. Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence: A sex role strain analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3, 270-283.

Goldberg, H. The new male: From self-destruction to self-care. New York: William Morrow & Co., Inc., 1979.

Jung, C.G. Animus and Anima, in Collected Works, Vol. 7. New York: Pantheon, 1953, pp. 188-211.

Jung, C.G. Concerning the archetypes, with special reference to the anima concept (1954), in Collected Works, Vol. 9, Part I. New York: Pantheon, 1959, pp. 54-72.

Lederer, W. The fear of women. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, 1968.

Nichols, J. Men's liberation: A new definition of masculinity. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1975.

Olson, K. Hey man! Open up and live. New York: Fawcett Gold Medal, 1978.

O'Neil, J.M. Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1981, 60, 203-210 (a).

O'Neil, J.M. Male sex-role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologists. Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9, 61-80 (b).

O'Neil, J.M. Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon and N. Levy (Eds.), Men in transition: Changing male roles, theory, and therapy. New York: Plenum Publishing Co., 1982.

Pleck, J. H. The myth of masculinity. Cambridge, Ma.: The MIT Press, 1981.

Spence, J.T., Helmrich, R., & Stapp, J. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A Measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 43.

Rummel, R. J. Applied factor analysis. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. Masculinity and Feminity: Their psychological dimensins, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Figure 1. Patterns of Gender Role Conflict and Strain Emanating From Men's Gender Role Socialization and The Masculine Mystique.

Jim O'Neil
University of Kansas
Lawerence, Kansas

Patterns of Gender Role Conflict

1. Restrictive Emotionality

Having difficulty expressing one's own feelings or denying others their rights to emotional expressiveness.

2. Homophobia

Having fears of homosexuals or fear of being a homosexual; beliefs, myths, and stereotypes about gay people.

3. Control

To regulate, restrain, or to have others or situations under one's command.

Power

To obtain authority, influence, or ascendancy over others.

Competition

Striving against others to win or gain something.

4. Restricted Sexual and Affectionate Behavior

Having limited ways of expressing one's sexuality and affection to others.

5. Obsession With Achievement and Success

Having a persistent preoccupation with work, accomplishment and eminence as a means of substantiating and demonstrating personal value.

6. Health Care Problems

Having difficulties maintaining positive health care in terms of diet, exercise, relaxation, stress, and a healthy life style.

Table 1

Factor Loading for Items of the FOFS

Factor 1 - Success, Power, Competition

Items		Factor Loadings
49. _____	I strive to be more successful than others.	.72
24. _____	Moving up the career ladder is important to me.	.64
39. _____	Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.	.61
27. _____	Competing with others is the best way to succeed.	.58
56. _____	I like to feel superior to other people.	.53
71. _____	Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.	.57
67. _____	I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.	.54
68. _____	I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.	.54
52. _____	I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.	.49
74. _____	Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.	.52
25. _____	I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.	.45
9. _____	Doing well all the time is important to me.	.43
12. _____	I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.	.41
M Factor Loading		.54

Factor 2 - Restrictive Emotionality

Items		Factor Loadings
30. _____	I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.	.78
40. _____	I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.	.76
31. _____	Telling my partner my feeling about him/her during sex is difficult for me.	.75
15. _____	I have difficulty telling others I care about them.	.70
11. _____	Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.	.52
23. _____	Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.	.44
85. _____	I do not like to show my emotions to other people.	.43
20. _____	I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.	.41
51. _____	Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.	.37
50. _____	Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.	.35
M Factor Loading		.55

Table 1 (Cont.)

Factor 3 - Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia

Items		Factor Loadings
70. _____	Affection with other men make me tense.	.69
57. _____	Hugging other men is difficult for me.	.71
37. _____	Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.	.67
35. _____	Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.	.66
82. _____	Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.	.58
83. _____	I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.	.52
75. _____	Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.	.50
3. _____	Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).	.48
M Factor Loading		.60

Factor 4 - Conflicts Between Work and Leisure - Family Relations

Items		Factor Loadings
81. _____	My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.	.70
84. _____	My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.	.65
33. _____	My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).	.58
41. _____	Finding time to relax is difficult for me.	.57
64. _____	I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.	.45
73. _____	Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.	.46
M Factor Loading		.57

Table 2

FEAR OF FEMININITY SCALE (FOFS)

SITUATIONAL BEHAVIOR SCALE - PART I

1. Age: ____ _

2. Educational Level: (check the highest level that fits you)

____Hig. School Diploma ____Freshman ____Sophomore ____Junior

____Senior ____Masters Degree ____Ph.D. ____Other

3. Present Marital Status: ____Married ____Single ____Divorced

____Remarried

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number which most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

1. _____ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.
2. _____ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.
3. _____ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.
4. _____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.
5. _____ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.
6. _____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
7. _____ Affection with other men make me tense.
8. _____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.
9. _____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
10. _____ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.
11. _____ My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.

12. _____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.
13. _____ Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.
14. _____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.
15. _____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
16. _____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.
17. _____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
18. _____ Doing well all the time is important to me.
19. _____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
20. _____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.
21. _____ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.
22. _____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.
23. _____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.
24. _____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
25. _____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.
26. _____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.
27. _____ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
28. _____ I strive to be more successful than others.
29. _____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
30. _____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.
31. _____ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).

32. _____ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.

33. _____ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.

34. _____ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.

35. _____ Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).

36. _____ Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.

37. _____ I like to feel superior to other people.

Factor Structure for Each Item

Factor 1 (13 items)

Items - 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 37

Factor 2 (10 Items)

Items - 2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, 30

Factor 3 (8 items)

Items - 3, 7, 10, 16, 20, 26, 33, 35

Factor 4 (6 items)

Items - 4, 11, 17, 27, 31, 36

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for PAQ Groups and Factors of the FOFS[1,2]

	FOFS Factor 1		FOFS Factor 2		FOFS Factor 3		FOFS Factor 4		FOFS Total Score	
PAQ Groups	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Masculine	56.68	8.97	30.98	8.08	30.33	7.85	20.87	5.88	139.17	20.75
Feminine	50.28	11.77	29.69	9.24	27.63	7.68	21.25	5.88	128.85	24.48
Androgynous	53.12	10.76	26.33	8.52	27.04	9.22	21.70	6.60	127.75	22.99
Undifferentiated	52.66	9.59	34.09	8.10	31.39	6.87	21.95	5.32	140.25	19.60

[1]Factor 1 = Success, Power, Competition
Factor 2 = Restrictive Emotionality
Factor 3 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia
Factor 4 = Conflicts Between Work and Leisure - Family Relations

[2]N=527, NOTE: High score indicates higher fear of self-concern regarding that attribute.